DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 745 JC 730 245

AUTHOR	Wynn, John T.
TITLE	A Study of Selected Aspects of Centralization versus Autonomy in the Administration of Multi-Campus Two-Year Colleges.
PUB DATE	Apr 73
NOTE	100p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Administration; Data Analysis; Data Collection; Doctoral Theses; *Educational Research; *Governance; *Junior Colleges; Post Secondary Education; *Questionnaires; Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS	*Multicampus Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The development of MCTYI (multicampus two-year institutions) represents a contemporary effort to solve the problems of population impact, economic and social necessity. This study was designed to determine the current placement of management authority and responsibility, to determine suggested changes in the placement of management authority and responsibility, and to generally describe the campus chief executive as well as the institution. All 235 NCTYI identified in the "1971 Junior College Directory" were included in this study. Replies from 154 provide the basis for the conclusions drawn. To determine the extent of campus autonomy, a questionnaire listing 21 functions was used. It was concluded that: (1) each of the four types of MCTYI operate differently in terms of the overall placement of management authority and responsibility; and (2) if changes do take place in accord with changes suggested by campus chief executives, more of the 21 functions will be placed at the campus level. A copy of the questionnaire is provided. (Author/DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 082745

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

University of Southern Mississippi

A STUDY OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF CENTRALIZATION VERSUS AUTONOMY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF MULTI-CAMPUS TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

BY

John T. Wynn

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School
of the University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

JC 730 245

Approved:

Joseph D. Carson, Jr.

Julian C. Brown

Edgar H. Beckenbaugh

Bobby A. Anderson

Aubrey Weatherford

Dean of the Graduate School

April, 1973

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John T. Wynn

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

COPYRIGHT BY

John T. Wynn

1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES iv

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS vi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vii

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION viii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem
Definition of Terms
Delimitations
Need for the Study
Methodology
Collection of Data
Treatment of Data
Organization of the Study

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 21

III. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 30

Introduction
Descriptive Presentation of Biographical/ Institutional Data
Presentation and Analysis of the Placement of Authority and Responsibility in MCTYI
Statistical Treatment of the Placement of Authority and Responsibility in MCTYI
Summary

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 69

Introduction
Conclusions
Recommendations

APPENDIX A 79
Questionnaire
APPENDIX B 82
Questionnaire Release
BIBLIOGRAPHY 85
VITA 89

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	MCTYI Campus 1971 Full Time Equivalent Enrollment	35
2.	Type of Experience Summary for MCTYI On-Campus Chief Executives	37
3.	Present and Previous Operating Titles of MCTYI On-Campus Chief Executives	39
4.	Current Placement of Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in Centralized Community Junior College MCTYI	42
5.	Current Placement of Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in Decentralized community Junior College MCTYI	44
6.	Current Placement of Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in Centralized college/university Operated MCTYI	46
7.	Current Placement of Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in Decentralized college/university Operated MCTYI	48
8.	Suggested Changes in the Placement of Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in Centralized Community Junior College MCTYI	51
9.	Suggested Changes in the Placement of Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in Decentralized Community Junior College MCTYI	53

Table

Page

10. Suggested Changes in the Placement of Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in Centralized College/University Operated MCTYI 55

11. Suggested Changes in the Placement of Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in Decentralized College/University Operated MCTYI 56

12. Chi Square Values Determined in Comparisons of the Placement of Current Authority and Responsibility for Twenty-one Selected Items in MCTYI 62

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Chart		Page
I	Treatment of Biographical Information . . .	14
II	Treatment of Type I and Type II Institutions	15
III	Treatment of Current Practices, Authority and Responsibility	15
IV	Treatment of Suggested Changes, Authority and Responsibility	16
V	Treatment of Type I, Current Practices and Suggested Changes	16
VI	Treatment of Type II, Current Practices and Suggested Changes	17

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Indebtedness to many for their assistance and cooperation in making this study possible is recognized.

Especial gratitude for the assistance and guidance given by Professor J.O. Carson, Chairman of the committee, is expressed. Appreciation to the balance of the doctoral committee for their assistance is expressed.

A special word of thanks to Kathy and Florence for help in preparing the manuscript.

Most importantly, acknowledgment of the debt to a family, especially Sally, Martha, Catherine, and Lorraine, whose deserving so far exceeds my giving.

University of Southern Mississippi

A STUDY OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF CENTRALIZATION VERSUS AUTONOMY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF MULTI-CAMPUS TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

by

John T. Wynn

Abstract of a Dissertation Submitted
to the Graduate School of the
University of Southern Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

April, 1973

ABSTRACT

The development of MCTYI (multi-campus two-year institutions) represents a contemporary effort to solve the problems of population impact, economic and social necessity. Although a relatively new type of educational institution and one in which there is high interest, there are very few studies describing or documenting MCTYI.

This study was designed to determine the current placement of management authority and responsibility, to determine suggested changes in the placement of management authority and responsibility, and to generally describe the campus chief executive as well as the institution. All 235 MCTYI identified in the 1971 Junior College Directory were included in this study. Community junior colleges MCTYI, college and university operated MCTYI, and state operated MCTYI were included in the study. Replies from 154 MCTYI provide the basis for conclusions drawn from the study.

To determine the extent of campus autonomy, a questionnaire listing twenty-one functions was used. Each MCTYI campus chief executive was asked to indicate the current placement as well as suggested changes in

the placement of authority and responsibility.

Four types of MCTYI were identified:

1. Centralized community junior college operated;
2. Decentralized community junior college operated;
3. Centralized college/university operated; and
4. Decentralized college/university operated.

Twelve questions were asked for the purpose of determining if there was any difference between the four different types of institutions in terms of management authority and responsibility. These questions in summary were:

Is there any difference in decentralized MCTYI between--

1. current practices of community junior college and college/university operated MCTYI;
2. suggested changes of community junior college and college/university operated MCTYI;
3. current practices and suggested changes of college/university operated MCTYI;
4. current practices and suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

Is there any difference in centralized MCTYI between--

5. current practices of community junior and college/university operated MCTYI;
6. suggested changes of community junior college and college/university operated MCTYI;
7. current practices and suggested changes of college/university operated MCTYI;

8. current practices and suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

Is there any difference between centralized and decentralized--

9. current practices of college/university operated MCTYI;

10. suggested changes of college/university operated MCTYI;

11. current practices of community junior college operated MCTYI;

12. suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

The study involved the asking of these questions for each of the twenty-one items on the questionnaire.

The limited number of suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility precluded answering eight of the questions.

It was concluded that:

1. Each of the four types of MCTYI operate differently in terms of the overall placement of management authority and responsibility; and

2. If changes do take place in accord with changes suggested by campus chief-executives, more of the twenty-one functions will be placed at the campus level.

It is recommended that:

1. More attention be given to studying MCTYI.

2. The educational philosophies of MCTYI be reviewed to determine if there are differences.

3. This study be replicated to determine if changes in the placement of authority and responsibility have taken place.

4. A study similar in nature and design be made of the district chief executive's perception of the placement of authority and responsibility.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

According to one 1969 study, "over one-quarter of the students in American colleges and universities are in multi-campus institutions."[1] Specifically, multi-campus two year colleges became a reality as early as the 1930's when Chicago opened a three campus structure with an initial enrollment of almost 4,000 students.[2] Branch campuses of colleges and universities were reported as early as the 1920's, with the establishment of the Los Angeles branch of the University of California.[3]

A generation later, in 1964, the number of multi-campus junior colleges was reported to be ten. Three years later this number had tripled to thirty-one multi-campus junior colleges; forty were reported in 1968.[4] A review of

---

[1]Frederick C. Kintzer, Arthur M. Jensen, and John S. Hansen, The Multi-Institution Junior College District (Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 2.

[2]Arthur M. Jensen, An Investigation of the Administration of Junior College Districts with Multi-Campuses (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1965), p. 27.

[3]Milton O. Jones, The Development of Multi-Unit Junior Colleges (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968), p. 14.

[4]Kintzer, Jensen, Hansen, Multi-Institution, p. 2.

the 1971 issue of the Junior College Directory identified some sixty institutional listings in twenty-six states involving 235 different campus sites.[1]

These sixty institutional organizations are made up of what are normally thought of as being multi-campus junior colleges such as: Dallas County, St. Louis, and Cleveland. Included also are the two-year units of the University of Alaska, University of Pennsylvania, Louisiana State University, and so on.

The development of multi-campus two-year educational institutions across the nation represents a contemporary effort to solve the problems of population impact, economic necessity, and social necessity. Jensen identified five reasons for multi-campus developments in his 1965 study.

1. To compensate for district geographical size which prohibited one campus from servicing the district adequately.
2. To equalize educational opportunities through making the college accessible.
3. To meet the differing educational needs of the various communities within the district.
4. To accommodate applicants after the only campus had reached its maximum capacity.
5. To keep each campus to a reasonable and functional size.[2]

---

[1]American Association of Junior Colleges. 1971 Junior College Directory (Washington, D.C., 1971), pp. 14-83, passim.

[2]Jensen, dissertation, pp. 55-57.

Multi-campus two-year institutions have had, and show every sign of continuing to have, sustained growth as the needs of society which conceived them show no signs of diminishing. As it was phrased by a Californian president, "Nostalgia may be all that is left to those who admire the single-institution district in urbanized areas."[1]

Statement of the Problem

It was the intention of this study to accomplish a three-part objective which relates to the administrative concept of multi-campus, two-year institutions. The first part of the objective of this study was to investigate the placement of management authority and management responsibility of multi-campus two-year institutions. The second part of the objective was to collect data regarding changes in the placement of management authority and management responsibility which was suggested by campus administrators. The final part of the objective was the gathering of limited biographical data on campus chief administrators. The purpose of gathering biographical data was to provide a frame of reference and perspective.

This three-part objective makes it possible to view, on a centralization/decentralization continuum, the current

---

[1]Kintzer, Jensen, Hansen, Multi-Institution, p. 34.

placement of the authority and responsibility exercised by multi-campus, campus chief executives. Likewise, any changes in authority and responsibility suggested by these campus chief administrators may be viewed on a centralization/decentralization continuum.

Closely related to the objective was the opportunity to compare the operation of junior colleges with college and university branch two-year institutions. Very little has been known about the style of operation of the college and university operated two-year institutions. It has been open to conjecture whether or not the two-year institutions affiliated with a college or university are performing similar functions educationally as are community junior colleges. This study, by design, compared the placement of authority and responsibility of community junior colleges to that of college and university affiliated institutions. Included in the general category of college and university operated two-year institutions were the state operated systems of junior colleges found in some states.

A community junior college typically serves a given geographic area and has a governing body or board chosen from that area. The college or university operated two-year institution typically reports to a governing body or board representing an entire state. State operated systems of junior colleges are included in the classification of college or university operated based on this rationale.

Given the dearth of current information, and the obvious impact of this type of educational institution, this study reviewed selected aspects of the administration of authority and responsibility in multi-campus two-year institutions. This study sought answers to the following questions:

1. In a multi-campus two-year institution that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of decentralization, is there in the authority and the responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the college or university operated institution and the community junior college operated institution?

2. In a multi-campus two-year institution that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of centralization, is there in the authority and the responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the college or university operated institution and the community junior college operated institution?

3. In a multi-campus two-year institution that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of decentralization, is there in the suggested changes in the authority and responsibility, any difference between the college or university operated institution and the community junior college operated institution?

4. In a multi-campus two-year institution that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of centralization, is there in the suggested changes in the authority and responsibility, any difference between the college or university operated institution and the community junior college operated institution?

5. In a college or university operated multi-campus two-year institution, is there in the authority and responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the institutions that have described themselves as having the characteristics of decentralization and those that have described themselves as having the characteristics of centralization?

6. In a community junior college operated multi-campus two-year institution, is there in the authority and responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the institutions that have described themselves as having the characteristics of decentralization and those that have described themselves as having the characteristics of centralization?

7. In a college or university operated multi-campus two-year institution, is there in the suggested changes in the authority and responsibility, any difference between the institutions that have described themselves as having the characteristics of decentralization and those

that have described themselves as having the characteristics of centralization?

8. In a community junior college operated multi-campus two-year institution, is there in the suggested changes in the authority and responsibility, any difference between the institutions that have described themselves as having the characteristics of decentralization and those that have described themselves as having the characteristics of centralization?

9. In a college or university operated multi-campus two-year institution that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of decentralization, is there in the placement of authority and responsibility, any difference between current practices and suggested changes?

10. In a college or university operated multi-campus two-year institution that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of centralization, is there in the placement of authority and responsibility, any difference between current practices and suggested changes?

11. In a community junior college operated multi-campus two-year institution that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of decentralization, is there in the placement of authority

and responsibility, any difference between current practices and suggested changes?

12. In a community junior college operated multi-campus two-year institution that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of centralization, is there in the placement of authority and responsibility, any difference between current practices and suggested changes?

Each of these twelve basic questions were asked for each of the twenty-one items in the questionnaire. In addition, biographical data has been summarized according to college or university operated decentralized institutions, college or university operated centralized institutions, community junior college decentralized institutions, and community junior college centralized institutions.

Definition of Terms

In anticipation of frequent use, certain terms are defined as follows:

1. Junior College.--A two-year institution offering instruction which may include but not be limited to, programs in: adult education; freshman and sophomore college transfer courses; vocational and technical instruction in fields leading to employment or up-grading; and general liberal arts programs.

2. Multi-campus Institutions.--A two-year institution operated by a community junior college or a college or university which has more than one permanent campus under a common board and which has an on-campus site administrator for each campus.

3. Type I Multi-campus.--A unit of a multi-campus institution which is provided leadership and services from a central or district office. The central or district office organizational structure is regarded more as line as opposed to staff. The district/central office generally develops the policies and procedures relating to areas such as curriculum approval, selection and assignment of personnel, in-service training, purchasing, accounting, and so on.

4. Type II multi-campus.--A unit of a multi-campus institution which is highly self reliant. The central or district office organizational structure is regarded more as staff as opposed to line. The on-site campus chief executive generally develops policies and procedures relating to areas such as admissions and records, community services, course content, course organization, library book processing, and so on.

5. MCTYI.--An abbreviation for: multi-campus, two-year institution(s).

Delimitations

This study was limited to junior colleges, community colleges, technical schools, colleges, universities, state operated MCTYI systems, or any other recognized United States educational institution listed in the 1971 Junior College Directory which has the responsibility of operating more than one, two-year campus is included in this study.

Need for the Study

The 1969 Kintzer report said, "The literature on educational administration is at best fragmentary." and "Yet the topic of multi-campus organization has been scarcely touched by researchers and administrators. Few publications are available at this time."[1]

Another author said, "Little or no effort has been made to study these multi-unit developments..." and, "Furthermore, few articles have appeared in The Junior College Journal explaining and reporting trends for this exciting phenomon."[2]

The development of multi-campus two-year institutions has been so rapid that documentation has fallen behind. Current practices have been largely communicated by word-of-mouth on an informal basis. It is generally

---

[1]Kintzer, Jensen, Hansen, Multi-Institution, p. 34.

[2]Jones, dissertation, p. 2.

recognized that there is great diversity in styles of organization and administration among the multi-campus two-year institutions.

Morrissey suggested that no body of theory or organizational concept has been followed or identified by the developing MCTYI.[1] Jones cited the absence of time and pressing student enrollments as circumstances under which the MCTYI have developed.[2] Jensen, Jones, Kintzer, and a few others undertook to identify, classify or otherwise construct and assemble a body of information about MCTYI.

This study updated MCTYI information as well as brought an added dimension of indicating likely areas of change in the placement of authority and responsibility found on a campus. The study also included college and university operated MCTYI.

Methodology

The subjects of the study, the questionnaire used, the collection of data, and the treatment of the data have been considered in this section.

Subjects

All indented listings in the 1971 Junior College Directory which indicated more than one campus location

---

[1]Kermit C. Morrissey, "Creative Leadership of Multi-Unit Colleges", The Junior College Journal, XXXVIII, No. 1 (1967), 38.

[2]Jones, dissertation, p. 2.

were included in this study. The Junior College Directory provided the name and address of each person responsible for an individual campus.

There were 235 subjects included in this study. These 235 subjects were the on-site chief administrators of individual MCTYI.

Questionnaire

The data were gathered by a questionnaire completed by each subject. A follow-up system was employed to insure as high a return as feasible.

The questionnaire was a modification of a form used by the Kintzer, Jensen, and Hansen study made in 1969.[1] The original purpose of the questionnaire was to gather data from multi-campus administrators to determine the extent of autonomy in practice. Permission to adapt and modify the questionnaire was given by Dr. John S. Hansen.[2]

The modification of the questionnaire provided an opportunity for a campus chief administrator to suggest changes in authority and responsibility which were viewed as desirable. A biographical/institutional data section was also added to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire is found in Appendix A.

---

[1]Kintzer, Jensen, Hansen, Multi-Institution, pp. 23-24.

[2]John S. Hansen, letter dated March 28, 1972 (See Appendix B.)

Collection of Data

The questionnaire was sent to all subjects. Followups by mail were used to insure as complete a return as possible. Of the 235 questionnaires sent out, 176, or seventy-five per cent, were returned. There were 154 usable responses.

Treatment of Data

The data collected were classified into three main categories: biographical/institutional; current responsibility pattern; and areas of responsibility where change was suggested. The data were also classified according to Type I and Type II MCTYI. The final classification is Type B, college or university operated, and Type A, community junior college operated, MCTYI.

As questionnaires were returned, the data regarding biographical/institutional data were summarized as indicated in Chart I. No further treatment of the biographical information other than summarization of each suggested item was considered in this writing.

As questionnaires were received, they were initially sorted according to college or university operated and community junior college operated. The questionnaires were further classified on the basis of the Type I and Type II institutions. This treatment provided for classifications of the data into eight main

CHART I

Treatment of Biographical Information

Operated by	Type I (Decentralized)	Type II (Centralized)
Type A (Community Junior College)	Biographical Information	Biographical Information
Type B (College or University)	Biographical Information	Biographical Information

categories for each of the twenty-one items in Part II of the questionnaire that related to authority and responsibility. These eight main categories are summarized in Chart II.

CHART II

Treatment of Authority and Responsibility Data

Operated by	Type I (Decentralized)	Type II (Centralized)
Type A (Community Junior Colleges)	Suggested Changes Current Practices (Twenty-one Items)	Suggested Changes Current Practices (Twenty-one Items)
Type B (College or University)	Suggested Changes Current Practices (Twenty-one Items)	Suggested Changes Current Practices (Twenty-one Items)

Once classified into the form summarized in Chart II, the data were subdivided according to current practices and suggested changes in authority and responsibility. Charts III and IV summarize the classification of this element of the questionnaire.

CHART III

Treatment of Current Practices, Authority and Responsibility Data

Operated by	Type I (Decentralized)	Type II (Centralized)
Type A (Community Junior Colleges)	Current Practices (Twenty-one Items)	Current Practices (Twenty-one Items)
Type B (College or University)	Current Practices (Twenty-one Items)	Current Practices (Twenty-one Items)

CHART IV

Treatment of Suggested Changes of Authority and Responsibility Data

Operated by	Type I (Decentralized)	Type II (Centralized)
Type A (Community Junior Colleges)	Suggested Changes (Twenty-one Items)	Suggested Changes (Twenty-one Items)
Type B (College or University)	Suggested Changes (Twenty-one Items)	Suggested Changes (Twenty-one Items)

The data were also classified according to Type I, college or university operated and community junior college operated, current practices in authority and responsibility, and suggested changes in authority and responsibility. The same classification was carried out for Type II institutions. Charts V and VI summarize this classification process.

CHART V

Treatment of Current Practices and Suggested Changes in Authority and Responsibility

Operated by	Type I (Decentralized)	Type I (Decentralized)
Type A (Community Junior College)	Current Practices (Twenty-one Items) ↔	Suggested Changes (Twenty-one Items)
Type B (College or University)	Current Practices (Twenty-one Items) ↔	Suggested Changes (Twenty-one Items)

CHART VI

Treatment of Current Practices and Suggested Changes in Authority and Responsibility

Operated by	Type II (Centralized)	Type II (Centralized)
Type A (Community Junior College)	Current Practices (Twenty-one Items) ↔	Suggested Changes (Twenty-one Items)
Type B (College or University)	Current Practices (Twenty-one Items) ↔	Suggested Changes (Twenty-one Items)

Upon completion of this classification process, the data from the questionnaires were summed by item in each cell of Chart III, Chart IV, Chart V, and Chart VI. The twenty-one items in the questionnaire that relate to current practices and the twenty-one items that relate to suggested changes had the capacity to generate as many as 252 cells of data. (Twenty-one items considered in twelve different ways.)

The simple measure of significance, Chi Square, was applied to the data to determine if there was any statistically significant differences at the five per cent level of significance. The calculations were performed using the "ChiChi" computer program developed by Donald J. Veldman.[1]

The data tested for statistical difference are indicated by arrows in Charts III and IV. There are twelve comparisons of the twenty-one items relating to current practices in authority and responsibility and of the twenty-one items relating to suggested changes in authority and responsibility.

The data represented by Charts V and VI were treated to determine the mean square contingency coefficient. The data so treated is indicated by arrows in Charts V and VI.

The use of the mean square contingency coefficient, usually referred to as C, yields a value that is similar

---

[1]Donald J. Veldman, Fortran for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967), pp. 295-307.

to the usual Pearson product moment, or correlation coefficient.[1] The Pearson r, or product moment was not indicated for use in this application because of the dichotomous characteristics as well as having data which falls in more than two classes.[2]

The use of C may be justified on the basis of the character of data arranged in a 2 x 3 contingency table. The value of C is limited to a maximum of .816 for this application.[3] This value is determined by the number of classes, which in this application was three.

The actual calculation of C may be accomplished by applying the formula, $C = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2}{N + \chi^2}}$.[4] The sign of C is not determined by this formula, which is a characteristic of C.[5]

The C values of the data in Charts V and VI were subject to the same limitations as may apply to the usual correlational techniques.

---

[1]Frederick E. Croxton and Dudley J. Cowden, Applied General Statistics (2nd ed.; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 489.

[2]Croxton and Cowden, Applied Statistics, p. 481.

[3]J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), pp. 338-339.

[4]Guilford, Fundamental Statistics, p. 338.

[5]Croxton and Cowden, Applied Statistics, p. 481.

Guilford cautions,

> Always, the coefficient of correlation is purely relative to the circumstances under which it was obtained and should be interpreted in the light of these circumstances, very rarely, certainly, in any absolute sense.[1]

The use of C as an approximation of the correlation coefficient may be viewed as an indicator of the degree of relationship only. It is not as accurate a measure as a Pearson r because it cannot achieve unity.

Organization of the Study

To serve as a guide for the completed study, the following organizational plan was followed:

Chapter I Introduction

This chapter included a statement of the problem, definition of terms, delimitations, need for the study, methodology, treatment of data, and a guide for the balance of the study.

Chapter II Review of Literature

This section of the study concerned itself with a review of the pertinent literature which relates to the placement of authority and responsibility in MCTYI.

Chapter III Analysis of Data

The presentation and analysis of the data collected for this study have been included in this chapter. The

---

[1]Guilford, Fundamental Statistics, p. 105.

presentation includes the Chi Square analysis of the elements which were determined to be significant at the five per cent level of confidence.

Chapter IV Summary

This chapter presents a summarization of the study and conclusions of the findings. Any recommendations, or suggestions for further study were included in this chapter.

Appendix A Questionnaire

Appendix B Questionnaire Release

Bibliography

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter concerns itself with a review of the pertinent studies in the area of multi-campus administration. The purpose and findings of these studies are summarized. A review of the literature produced only three major investigations in the area of multi-campus administration to light. Their primary thrust and chronological order follow.

In 1965, Jensen authored "An Investigation of the Administration of Junior College Districts With Multi-Campuses". At the time, Jensen was completing his doctoral requirements at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Jensen based the need for his study on the increase of multi-campus institutions; projections showing a continued increase in the number of multi-campus institutions; and the definite need to establish sound administrative principles and procedures for multi-campus institutions.[1]

---

[1]Jensen, dissertation, p. x.

Jensen undertook to determine the reasons for multi-campus junior colleges; to determine the type of organization used in multi-campus junior colleges; and to identify the administrative policies and procedures in use.[1] This he accomplished by means of case studies of and visits to ten multi-campus districts.

He was able to classify multi-campus districts into three categories:

> Group I (Multi-College)--districts operating each campus as an individual comprehensive college;
>
> Group II (Multibranch)--districts operating as one legal institution with comprehensive branches or campuses;
>
> Group III (Multiprogram)--districts operating as one legal institution, but whose campuses offer different educational programs.[2]

Jensen studied a total of ten multi-campus junior college districts. Of these ten subjects, Jensen classified two as being multi-college; five as being multi-branch; and three as being multi-program. Curiously, the two multi-colleges were under the control, in one case, of an independent junior college district board and, in the other case, a shared board of education. The most common form of control was that of the independent junior college districts which operated a total of some

---

[1]Jensen, dissertation, p. x.

[2]Jensen, dissertation, p. xi.

five districts of the ten studied. Other forms of control were a unified school district board of education, and a county public board of education.[1]

Placed on a continuum, the most centralized structure would be that of the multi-branch institutions; multi-program institutions would represent the medial position with respect to centralization vs decentralization. The most decentralized or autononymous would be the multi-college.

Jensen reported ten major findings which are summarized and condensed in the following:

1. A general trend to the multi-college (Group I) concept.
2. Involved groups favored the multi-college (Group I) concept because of the autonomy it represented.
3. The districts studied did not have internal geographic boundaries.
4. Multi-college organizations had no intermediary between the campus administrators and the chief executive of the district as did both the multi-program and multi-branch organization.
5. The district or central level determines policies and procedures for the formation of curriculum objectives.
6. Student personnel services were autononymous to each site, with no central office staff in all instances.
7. Majority opinion in all categories agreed that planning is not comprehensive enough and fails to anticipate future campus needs. The planning was done in all cases at the district level.

---

[1]Jensen, dissertation, p. 62.

8. Employment processes for the individual campuses were subject to some control and restraints by the central offices.

9. Business affairs, by unanimous agreement, should be handled on a district level.

10. Community services was an individual campus function in all of the districts but one.[1]

Following the 1965 contribution by Jensen was the 1968 study made by Milton O. Jones who undertook a study of the:

> philosophy of central control versus individual autonomy; the structure of the organization, multi-campus or multi-college; and the question of centralized or decentralized services.[2]

He also cited the need for descriptive data. Jones summarizes his purpose in doing his study with the statement:

> ...provide another step toward some organized approach for studying the entire questions of multi-unit organization in the community junior college.[3]

Jones in his study found the need to describe multi-unit colleges with four models:

The One College, Branch Centers Model is described as being one of the first steps toward a multi-unit operation. This model is characterized as providing leadership and services from one college in a central office. Dispersion of certain elements of the college

---

[1]Jensen, dissertation, pp. xi-xii.

[2]Jones, dissertation, p. iv.

[3]Jones, dissertation, p. 8.

such as technical offerings, continuing education, specific divisions representing special areas, and other such elements are supervised through some person from the central office. Functions, such as registration, course outlines, and the like are performed by the parent institution.

The One College, Multi-Campus Model is distinguished by operating multi-units as a single institutional entity. Jones suggests visualizing one large campus divided into parts and located at different places. The parts represent identical twins operating under central authority.

The Multi-Campus, District Model described by Jones is similar to the foregoing model. The two primary differences are in legal organization which is broader based than a single institution and in the greater autonomy of a campus. Each campus has its own budget, library, faculty and staff. Jones says, "The parts (district office and several campuses) are aligned with one another to serve a functional purpose. The purpose is to assure maximum coordination and cooperation among all units in the organization with a minimum of control." Campuses are generally accredited separately in this model.

The Multi-College, District Model is a rapidly emerging concept according to Jones. It visualizes the colleges as "separate, autonomous institutions, loosely

coordinated within a district framework." This model recognizes a district head who generally is responsible for master planning for the district, for communication with the governing board, and for providing whatever services as may be most efficiently provided from a central office.[1]

"The Multi-Institution Junior College District," published in 1969 by Kintzer, Jensen, and Hansen is the most significant contribution to the field.

This report was prepared under the auspices of the Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse for Junior College Information at the University of California, Los Angeles, and in cooperation with American Association of Junior Colleges. This study included all known multi-institution junior college districts, excluding both state and university operated systems.[2]

The purpose of the study was to gather information regarding district administrative organizational trends and to clarify the relationship between the district office and the colleges. In the accomplishment of this broad purpose, the authors studied some seventy-five chief on campus administrators as well as forty-five superintendents of multi-institution junior college districts.

---

[1]Jones, dissertation, pp. 26-31.

[2]Kintzer, Jensen, Hansen, Multi-Institution, p. 4.

The studies were made through the use of two inquiry forms. The first form called for factual responses while the second solicited opinions regarding multi-institution vs single institution and the question of centralized vs decentralized administration in multi-institution junior college districts.

The findings of the factual form were summarized as follows:

1. Personnel matters seem most often to be a prerogative of the college;

2. Regarding curricular matters, about one half indicate that this should be shared between the district and the college and the other one-half would indicate this to be a college matter;

3. Clearly the responsibility of the colleges are matters relative to course content and organization, text book, and library book selection;

4. Student personnel services are considered to be college responsibilities. Auxilliary services involving money seem to be more the responsibility of the district;

5. Research and planning are considered to be district responsibilities primarily;

6. Accreditation seemed to be primarily a college responsibility, although many reported responsibility shared with the district;

7. Publicity appeared to be a college responsibility in about one-half of the institutions and a shared responsibility by the other one-half;

8. Finance was considered to be primarily a district responsibility;

9. Of forty areas surveyed, more were considered to be college responsibility than as district responsibility.[1]

---

[1]Kintzer, Jensen, Hansen, Multi-Institution, pp. 25-26.

The authors conclude by this that most of the respondents felt that they enjoyed a great deal of autonomy. Responses also indicated a fairly high degree of uniformity among district colleges regarding such areas as class schedules, teaching loads, salary schedules, basic policy relating to employment, and so on. The authors note that it is curious to find such a high degree of uniformity among colleges that report what appears to be a fairly high degree of autonomy.

The second inquiry related to the questions of multi-institution vs single institution and of centralized vs decentralized administration. This second inquiry found that a high degree of district office control may bring about high economies, efficiency, and impartial treatment. The second inquiry also found that "buck passing", lower morale, and depersonalization may also come about.

It was judged by the authors therefore, that a balance of extremes is best with specific areas of responsibility being primarily district or college centered as appropriate. It was specifically concluded that, "the multi-institution district can often function much more efficiently than can two or more smaller districts serving the same area."[1]

---

[1]Kintzer, Jensen, Hanse, Multi-Institution, p. 34.

Apart from these three studies, no other significent sources regarding the organization and administration of multi-unit two-year institutions were found. This single thought has been expressed in each of the three studies.

A thorough review of Dissertation Abstracts International, a computer search of the ERIC collection of the U.S. Office of Education as well as the complete collection of the Current Index to the Journals in Education by the School Research Information Service of Phi Delta Kappa, searches of the Junior College Journal, and of other usual sources uncovered relatively few references.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study of selected aspects of centralization versus autonomy in the administration of multi-campus two-year colleges may be viewed as having three distinct elements. The first element was the gathering of descriptive data relating to the institutions and the administrators included in this study. The second element was to determine the actual placement of management authority and responsibility as perceived or determined by the administrator in charge of a campus. The final element was one of determining what changes, if any, would be suggested by the campus administrator in the placement of management authority and responsibility.

With these elements in mind, limited biographical and institutional data was gathered. These data, in summarized form, have been presented largely in narrative form since the intention of the data was to provide a framework or perspective for the balance of the study.

The primary thrust of the study was focused upon the current placement of management authority and

responsibility as well as suggested changes in the placement of management authority for twenty-one selected items. The purpose of the study was to determine the degree or extent of autonomy given to a campus.

A series of twelve questions to be asked for each of the twenty-one items regarding the placement of management authority and responsibility was developed. These twelve questions are presented in summary form as follows:

Is there any difference in decentralized MCTYI between--

1. current practices of community junior college and college/university operated MCTYI;
2. suggested changes of community junior college and college/university operated MCTYI;
3. current practices and suggested changes of college/university operated MCTYI;
4. current practices and suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

Is there any difference in centralized MCTYI between--

5. current practices of community junior and college/university operated MCTYI;
6. suggested changes of community junior college and college-university operated MCTYI;
7. current practices and suggested changes of college/university operated MCTYI;
8. current practices and suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

Is there any difference between centralized and decentralized--

9. current practices of college/university operated MCTYI;

10. suggested changes of college/university operated MCTYI;

11. current practices of community junior college operated MCTYI;

12. suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

The twelve questions posed above are the material around which the principal substance of this chapter has been constructed. Each question has been applied to the twenty-one selected items of the questionnaire.

Of the 235 institutions identified in the 1971 Directory of Junior Colleges which were asked to respond to the study, replies were received from 176. The 176 replies provided 154 usable responses. Therefore, about seventy-five per cent of the census replied and responses from sixty-six per cent of the identified census population provided the data for this study. The twenty-two replies which were not used were incomplete in some aspect, such as failing to identify the type or classification of the institution.

Descriptive Presentation of Biographical Institutional Data

There were thirteen questions in Part I of the questionnaire. These questions were designed to gather

information about the nature or character of the institution proper and of the on-campus chief executive. The area did not lend itself to sophisticated statistical treatment for the purpose of this study. The sole intent of including the information was to provide a frame of reference for the balance of the study. The reader may, through inference and value judgments, draw some conclusions regarding the balance of the study.

Of the many values and summaries of information that follow, perhaps the most important was the composition of the 154 usable responses in terms of types of institutions. There were included in this study, thirty-four centralized community junior college operated MCTYI and sixty-one decentralized. There were forty college/university operated MCTYI, and nineteen decentralized. These sum to 154 different institutions.

When asked the total number of MCTYI in the district, it was found that there were as many as eighteen campuses among the centralized college/university operated MCTYI; the average was six campuses. For both centralized and decentralized community junior colleges, there were an average of three campuses, and as many as thirteen campuses in a single district. Decentralized college/university operated MCTYI reported as many as fourteen campuses, with an average of five. Thus community junior

colleges may be considered to be a bit smaller in terms of the number of organizational units, but not emphatically so.

The question of the location of the district/central office determined that there were on-campus locations for eight centralized community junior colleges, ten for decentralized community junior colleges, two for centralized college/university operated MCTYI, and four for decentralized college/university operated MCTYI. There were twenty-six off-campus district/central office locations an average of twenty-six miles from each campus for centralized community junior college operated MCTYI; fifty-one off-campus locations an average of twenty-two miles were reported for decentralized community junior college operated MCTYI. College/university operated MCTYI reported thirty-nine off-campus locations an average of ninety-seven miles from each campus for centralized type MCTYI and for decentralized there were fifteen off-campus an average of eighty-eight miles from each campus. It seemed a bit curious to note that the autonomous or decentralized MCTYI were slightly closer to the district/central office than were the centralized MCTYI.

When asked the Fall 1971 campus Full Time Equivalent enrollment, the four types of MCTYI gave a wide range of

responses. These responses have been incorporated into Table I, MCTYI Campus Full Time Equivalent Enrollment, 1971. It was interesting to note that the college/university operated MCTYI enrollment was by and large, smaller than found in the community junior college operated MCTYI.

TABLE I

MCTYI CAMPUS 1971 FULL TIME EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT

Enrollment	0-500	501-1000	1001-3000	3001-6000	6001-9000	9001-up
Centralized Community Junior College	5	3	11	9	2	4
Decentralized Community Junior College	4	5	27	16	8	1
Centralized College/University Operated	19	16	5	0	0	0
Decentralized College/University Operated	8	5	5	1	0	0

Such a wide range of responses were given to the length of time the campus had been in operation that the results have been reported by the mode. Community junior college operated MCTYI of the centralized type most often reported five years of operation compared with six years of operation for the decentralized type MCTYI. College/university operated MCTYI of the centralized type most

often reported ten years while the decentralized type reported seven years of operation.

Definitions were given and the respondents were asked which definition best described their campus. The definitions forced the respondents to classify themselves as a decentralized or centralized type of institution. There were seventy-four centralized and eighty decentralized type institutions according to this definition. In the same general area, ninety-five respondents reported themselves as being community junior college operated MCTYI, and fifty-nine reported themselves as part of a college/university operated MCTYI.

Question seven of Part I of the questionnaire asked each respondent to indicate the type of background in terms of experience. Responses to this question were given in years by some, and merely checked off by others. The results for this question have been converted to percentages as shown in Table 2, Type of Experience Summary for MCTYI On-Campus Chief Executives.

The percentages shown were obtained by dividing the number of responses in any given area of experience by the base number of institutions. Thus, of the thirty-four centralized community junior college operated MCTYI, one of the campus chief executives reported he had had experience as a staff person in the grades k-6. The

TABLE 2

TYPE OF EXPERIENCE SUMMARY FOR MCTYI ON-CAMPUS CHIEF EXECUTIVES

Area of Experience	Grades K-6	Grades 7-12	Jr. College	Sr. College	Business	Military
Staff Experience						
Centralized Community Junior College	3%	54%	43%	29%	14%	20%
Decentralized Community Junior College	17%	60%	50%	28%	8%	16%
Centralized College/ University Operated	10%	41%	20%	34%	7%	15%
Decentralized College/ University Operated	0	37%	26%	43%	5%	11%
Line Experience						
Centralized Community Junior College	3%	20%	33%	17%	17%	26%
Decentralized Community Junior College	8%	37%	87%	27%	13%	45%
Centralized College/ University Operated	12%	37%	61%	49%	24%	32%
Decentralized College/ University Operated	11%	32%	68%	16%	11%	16%

percentage given is three per cent or 1/34. These percentages are not addative. As an example, one may refer to Table 2 and determine that forty-one per cent of the campus chief executives of centralized college/university operated MCTYI have had experience as a staff person in the grades 7-12.

For all types of MCTYI responding, the modal age of the chief executive was given as forty-five to forty-nine years. The age range of thirty to sixty-four was given by all types of MCTYI except for a "young" (age range twenty-five to thirty years) chief executive of a decentralized college/university operated MCTYI.

Only one female MCTYI chief executive was reported. The balance of the MCTYI campus chief executives were male.

Two questions relating to titles were asked. The first question asked the MCTYI campus chief executive to report the title currently in use. The second question asked the previous operating title. There was, unfortunately, apparently some confusion with these two questions or else many of the campus chief executives had changed jobs, but not necessarily their role of responsibility. This observation is based on the data in Table 3, Present and Previous Operating Title of MCTYI On-Campus Chief Executives. One may observe the fairly high number of

TABLE 3

PRESENT AND PREVIOUS OPERATING TITLES OF MCTYI ON-CAMPUS EXECITIVES

Titles	Pres.	Vice Pres.	Dean	Exec. Dean	Dir.	Exec. Dir.	Provost	Aca. Dean	Other
Present Title									
Centralized Community Junior College	17	0	4	8	4	1	0	0	0
Decentralized Community Junior College	37	2	7	1	7	1	5	0	0
Centralized College/ University Operated	3	0	10	0	27	0	1	0	0
Decentralized College/ University Operated	3	0	5	0	8	0	3	0	0
Previous Title									
Centralized Community Junior College	5	1	9	2	4	0	0	13	1
Decentralized Community Junior College	14	4	9	0	5	0	1	26	1
Centralized College/ University Operated	20	0	1	0	10	1	0	5	2
Decentralized College/ University Operated	5	0	2	1	2	0	1	3	5

reports of "President" in the section which contains "previous operating title".

The last question in Part I of the questionnaire asked how many professional staff report directly to the campus chief executive. Judging from the responses, it was surmised that many of the chief executives reported not only the number of immediate staff, but the entire teaching faculty as well. Because of the suspect nature of the data, no results have been reported for this question.

Presentation and Analysis of the Placement of Authority and Responsibility in MCTYI

This portion of the study was directed at the presentation of data generated by Part II of the questionnaire. The reader is reminded that Part II was concerned with determining the current placement of management authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items or functions. It was also concerned with determining any suggested changes in the placement of that authority and responsibility.

It will be found that eight tables (Tables 4-11) have been prepared. There are two tables for each of the four types of institutions studied--one showing current placement and the other showing suggested changes.

The first series of four tables (Tables 4-7) are presentations of the current placement of authority and

responsibility. These tables have been arranged so as to show the actual responses and percentage values. The percentage value is an expression of the actual number shown divided by the total number of responses for each item. Some respondents did not give an answer to each of the twenty-one items which caused some slight variation in the denominators. The percentages may not add precisely to 100 per cent due to rounding.

In Table 4 is found the placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in centralized community junior college operated MCTYI. It may be seen that there was fairly wide latitude in the placement of authority and responsibility with respect to the twenty-one items. Most of the authority and responsibility was placed at the campus level with nine of the items having a clear majority in terms of placement. Of the remaining twelve items, three had a clear majority of placement at the district level and three at the shared level of authority and responsibility. There were six items where the placement of authority and responsibility was divided among all three levels in fairly even proportions.

Of all the items, the placement of authority and responsibility for item 6, course content and organization, appeared to be most clearly a campus decision area. Consistent with the general conception of a centralized institution was the placement of authority and responsibility

TABLE 4

CURRENT PLACEMENT OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWENTY-ONE SELECTED ITEMS IN CENTRALIZED COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE MCTY1

Function	Campus #	Campus %	District #	District %	Shared #	Shared %
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	22	65	4	12	8	24
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	18	53	5	15	11	32
3 Curriculum planning and development	18	53	4	12	12	35
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	10	30	11	32	12	36
5 Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	9	26	13	38	12	35
6 Course content and organization	30	83	2	6	2	6
7 Library book processing	25	74	8	24	1	3
8 Admissions and Records	25	74	4	12	5	15
9 Food Services	22	65	10	29	2	6
10 Facility Planning and utilization research	4	12	13	38	17	50
11 Instructional improvement research	16	48	6	18	11	33
12 Educational planning research	12	38	8	26	12	38
13 Accreditation activities	12	35	6	18	16	47
14 Community services	25	74	4	12	5	15
15 Publicity	9	26	6	18	18	53
16 Administrative data processing	1	3	24	71	9	26
17 Purchasing	3	9	21	62	10	29
18 Accounting	3	9	23	68	8	24
19 Budget development	3	9	8	24	23	68
20 Budget administration	11	32	9	26	14	41
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	19	56	7	21	8	24

for item 16, administrative data processing, at the district level in a majority of the institutions.

In Table 5 is found the current placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in decentralized community junior college MCTYI. Table 5 was representative of an autonomymous type institution, and the data did tend to confirm this position.

Thirteen of the twenty-one functions were clearly placed at the campus level. Only for three of the twenty-one items was the placement of authority and responsibility at the district level in a majority of the institutions. Of the remaining five items, two were placed at a shared level; only three of the items were distributed amcng the three possible levels without a majority.

Possibly the most important item from the standpoint of campus autonomy was that of budget administration, item 20. Interestingly, item 20 was pulling away from centralization in terms of placement and leaning in favor of autonomy or decentralization. Some reinforcement of this observation was found in the responses to items 16, 17, and 18.

These three items, administrative data processing, purchasing, and accounting were the only three of the twenty-one items where the placement of authority and responsibility was at the district level in a majority of

TABLE 5

CURRENT PLACEMENT OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWENTY-ONE SELECTED ITEMS IN DECENTRALIZED COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE MCTYI

Function	Campus #	Campus %	District #	District %	Shared #	Shared %
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	47	77	1	2	13	21
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	45	74	3	5	13	21
3 Curriculum planning and development	44	72	2	3	15	25
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	32	53	10	17	18	30
5 Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	28	47	8	13	24	40
6 Course content and organization	54	89	3	5	4	7
7 Library book processing	50	82	9	15	2	3
8 Admissions and Records	50	82	6	10	5	8
9 Food Services	46	78	9	15	4	7
10 Facility Planning and utilization research	13	21	15	25	33	54
11 Instructional improvement research	40	66	7	11	14	23
12 Educational planning research	32	53	8	13	20	33
13 Accreditation activities	45	75	3	5	12	20
14 Community services	51	84	4	7	6	10
15 Publicity	27	44	13	21	21	34
16 Administrative data processing	7	12	35	59	17	29
17 Purchasing	6	10	37	62	17	28
18 Accounting	3	5	36	60	21	35
19 Budget development	13	22	8	13	39	65
20 Budget administration	25	42	9	15	25	43
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	36	59	8	13	17	28

the institutions. Even so, in almost one-third of the institutions, these three items were reported as shared.

Table 6 presents data about the current placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in centralized college/university operated MCTYI. The data of this table were representative of a MCTYI that regarded the central or district office in more of a line as opposed to staff relationship.

A review of Table 6 shows that of the twenty-one functions, the placement of management authority and responsibility was found seven times at the campus level, two times at the district, and three times at a shared level in a majority of the institutions. The remaining nine of the twenty-one items were not placed, in a majority of the institutions, at any one of the three possible levels.

For those two of the twenty-one items where authority and responsibility was placed at the district level for a majority of the institutions, item 16, administrative data processing was probably the most indicative of the type of organization found in the placement of authority and responsibility for this type of MCTYI. Item 4, transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation, was important, of course, but not so revealing as item 16. Note that for item 4 and 16, the majority was not really too impressive.

TABLE 6

CURRENT PLACEMENT OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWENTY-ONE SELECTED ITEMS IN CENTRALIZED COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY OPERATED MCTYI

Function	Campus #	Campus %	District #	District %	Shared #	Shared %
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	23	58	2	5	15	38
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	30	75	3	8	7	18
3 Curriculum planning and development	10	25	11	28	19	48
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	4	11	22	58	12	32
5 Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	8	24	11	32	15	44
6 Course content and organization	13	33	13	33	13	33
7 Library book processing	25	64	9	23	5	13
8 Admissions and Records	15	38	11	28	13	33
9 Food Services	27	90	1	3	2	7
10 Facility Planning and utilization research	10	26	12	31	17	44
11 Instructional improvement research	16	41	11	28	12	31
12 Educational planning research	13	34	9	24	16	42
13 Accreditation activities	10	25	9	23	21	52
14 Community services	33	87	3	8	2	5
15 Publicity	29	74	3	8	7	18
16 Administrative data processing	5	14	20	56	11	31
17 Purchasing	4	10	13	33	23	58
18 Accounting	6	15	16	40	18	45
19 Budget development	9	23	5	12	26	65
20 Budget administration	16	40	8	20	16	40
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	31	79	3	8	5	13

A position might be considered regarding the nine items where there was no majority of institutions at any one of the three possible levels of placement. This position would tend to reinforce the general concept of a centralized MCTYI by virtue of not being placed at the campus level. A position that there was a great deal of "cooperation" between the campus level and the district level might also be made.

Seen in Table 7 are data concerning the current placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in decentralized college/university operated MCTYI. This table is the last of a series of four tables reporting on the current placement of authority and responsibility.

In Table 7, there were no items where the majority of institutions place authority and responsibility at the district level. There were fourteen items where the majority of institutions reported placement of authority at the campus level, three items at the shared level, and four items where there was no majority at any of the three possible levels.

Item 20, budget administration, was fairly strong with about sixty-eight per cent of the institutions reporting placement of the authority and responsibility for this function at the campus level. Other of the twenty-one items had higher percentage values, but

TABLE 7

CURRENT PLACEMENT OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWENTY-ONE SELECTED ITEMS IN DECENTRALIZED COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY OPERATED MCTYI

Function	Campus #	Campus %	District #	District %	Shared #	Shared %
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	13	68	2	11	4	21
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	16	84	2	11	1	5
3 Curriculum planning and development	9	47	6	32	4	21
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	4	21	6	32	9	47
5 Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	9	50	4	21	5	28
6 Course content and organization	12	63	3	16	4	21
7 Library book processing	14	74	3	16	2	11
8 Admissions and Records	9	50	4	21	5	28
9 Food Services	10	67	3	20	2	13
10 Facility Planning and utilization research	5	26	3	16	11	58
11 Instructional improvement research	10	53	2	11	7	37
12 Educational planning research	11	61	2	11	5	28
13 Accreditation activities	8	21	2	11	9	47
14 Community services	14	74	4	21	1	5
15 Publicity	11	53	3	16	5	26
16 Administrative data processing	5	28	7	39	6	33
17 Purchasing	10	53	4	21	5	26
18 Accounting	3	16	3	16	13	68
19 Budget development	5	26	2	11	12	63
20 Budget administration	13	68	3	16	3	16
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	12	63	4	21	3	16

item 20 is perhaps the most important from the standpoint of campus autonomy. Most important from the standpoint of autonomy was the absence of any majority of institutions reporting placement of authority and responsibility at the district level.

To recapitulate Tables 4 through 7, consider that a majority of the institutions placed current management authority and responsibility for the twenty-one items at the level of the:

1. Campus for 9 items for centralized community junior colleges;

   13 items for decentralized community junior colleges;

   7 items for centralized college/university operated MCTYI; and

   14 items for decentralized college/university operated MCTYI.

2. District - 3 items for centralized community junior colleges;

   3 items for decentralized community junior colleges;

   2 items for centralized college/university operated MCTYI; and

   0 items for decentralized college/university operated MCTYI.

3. Shared for 3 items for centralized community junior colleges;

   2 items for decentralized community junior colleges;

   3 items for centralized college/university operated MCTYI; and

3 items for decentralized college/ university operated MCTYI.

4. "Mixed" (not at campus, district, or shared level in a majority)

6 items for centralized community junior colleges;

3 items for decentralized community junior colleges;

9 items for centralized college/university operated MCTYI; and

4 items for decentralized college/ university operated MCTYI.

In Tables 8 thru 11 are shown suggested changes in the placement of management authority and responsibility made by the on-site campus chief executives of the MCTYI in this study. These tables are reported in the same sequence by type of institution as were Tables 4 through 7. As an example, Table 4 reports the current placement while Table 8 reports suggested changes in the current placement of authority and responsibility for centralized community junior college MCTYI.

Shown in Table 8 are the suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in centralized community junior college MCTYI. Note that change was suggested in each of the twenty-one items. The greatest number of suggested changes lay in item 20, budget administration, where eight of the MCTYI suggested that this function be changed to the campus level of authority and responsibility.

TABLE 8

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE PLACEMENT OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWENTY-ONE SELECTED ITEMS IN CENTRALIZED COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE MCTYI

Function	Campus	District	Shared
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	2	0	0
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	1	0	0
3 Curriculum planning and development	1	1	0
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	1	1	0
5 Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	1	1	0
6 Course content and organization	2	0	0
7 Library book processing	1	1	1
8 Admissions and Records	1	0	0
9 Food Services	4	0	1
10 Facility Planning and utilization research	1	0	1
11 Instructional improvement research	3	0	0
12 Educational planning research	2	3	1
13 Accreditation activities	1	0	0
14 Community services	2	1	1
15 Publicity	2	1	0
16 Administrative data processing	2	0	1
17 Purchasing	4	0	0
18 Accounting	2	0	0
19 Budget development	2	0	1
20 Budget administration	8	0	2
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	3	0	2

In all, there were forty-six suggestions being made to place authority and responsibility at the campus level. Nine suggestions were made for change to place authority and responsibility at the district level. There were eleven suggestions for change in the placement of authority and responsibility to the shared level. A total of sixty-six MCTYI offered some suggested change in the placement of authority and responsibility.

Seen in Table 9 are suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in decentralized community junior college MCTYI. A total of sixty-nine suggestions for change in the placement of management authority and responsibility were recorded. Of these sixty-nine suggestions, fifty-one suggested placement at the campus level, seven at the district level, and eleven at the shared level. Suggestions for change were made in nineteen of the twenty-one items.

The greatest number of suggested changes in the placement of management authority and responsibility occurred in item 15, publicity, where eight suggested that this function be placed at the campus level. There were two suggestions made for this function to be placed at the shared level of authority and responsibility.

In Table 10 are seen the suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in centralized college/university operated

TABLE 9

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE PLACEMENT OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWENTY-ONE SELECTED ITEMS IN DECENTRALIZED COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE MCTYI

Function	Campus	District	Shared
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	3	1	0
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	4	0	0
3 Curriculum planning and development	1	2	0
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	2	0	0
5 Terminal of occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	2	0	0
6 Course content and organization	1	0	0
7 Library book processing	0	0	0
8 Admissions and Records	3	0	0
9 Food Services	2	0	1
10 Facility Planning and utilization research	4	0	0
11 Instructional improvement research	1	1	1
12 Educational planning research	0	1	0
13 Accreditation activities	0	0	0
14 Community services	2	0	1
15 Publicity	8	0	2
16 Administrative data processing	2	0	3
17 Purchasing	5	0	2
18 Accounting	1	0	1
19 Budget development	2	1	0
20 Budget administration	2	0	0
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	6	1	0

MCTYI. A total of eighty-two suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility were made in Table 10. Of these eighty-two suggested changes, sixty-six were for placement of authority and responsibility to the campus level, only three to the district level, and thirteen to a shared level. There were no suggested changes made for item 6, course content and organization.

The greatest number of suggested changes occurred in item 3, curriculum planning and development, where there were six suggestions that authority and responsibility be placed at the campus level for this function. There was also one suggestion that authority and responsibility be placed at the shared level for this function.

In Table 11 are seen the suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in decentralized college/university operated MCTYI. Only thirteen changes were suggested in the placement of authority and responsibility in Table 11. These thirteen suggested changes did not affect eleven of the twenty-one items. Of the thirteen suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility, eleven suggested placement at the campus level, two at the district level, and none for change at the shared level.

Of the thirteen suggestions for change, none were especially greater in number than any other for any one of the ten items where change was suggested. The thirteen

TABLE 10

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE PLACEMENT OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWENTY-ONE SELECTED ITEMS IN CENTRALIZED COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY OPERATED MCTYI

Function	Campus	District	Shared
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	2	0	0
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	1	0	0
3 Curriculum planning and development	6	0	1
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	3	1	2
5 Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	5	1	3
5 Course content and organization	3	0	0
7 Library book processing	1	0	0
8 Admissions and Records	0	0	0
9 Food Services	2	0	0
10 Facility Planning and utilization research	2	1	0
11 Instructional improvement research	2	0	2
12 Educational planning research	4	0	1
13 Accreditation activities	2	0	1
14 Community services	3	0	0
15 Publicity	4	0	2
16 Administrative data processing	4	0	1
17 Purchasing	5	0	0
18 Accounting	4	0	0
19 Budget development	4	0	0
20 Budget administration	4	0	0
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	5	0	0

TABLE 11

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE PLACEMENT OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWENTY-ONE SELECTED ITEMS IN DECENTRALIZED COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY OPERATED MCTYI

Function	Campus	District	Shared
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	0	0	0
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	0	0	0
3 Curriculum planning and development	2	0	0
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	2	1	0
5 Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	1	0	0
6 Course content and organization	0	0	0
7 Library book processing	0	0	0
8 Admissions and Records	1	0	0
9 Food Services	0	0	0
10 Facility Planning and utilization research	0	0	0
11 Instructional improvement research	0	1	0
12 Educational planning research	1	0	0
13 Accreditation activities	0	0	0
14 Community services	0	0	0
15 Publicity	0	0	0
16 Administrative data processing	1	0	0
17 Purchasing	1	0	0
18 Accounting	1	0	0
19 Budget development	0	0	0
20 Budget administration	1	0	0
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	0	0	0

suggestions for change were spread out among the ten items rather evenly.

To summarize Tables 8 through 11, suggestions for change in the placement of management authority and responsibility occurred:

for 21 items in centralized community junior colleges;

19 items in decentralized community junior colleges;

20 items in centralized college/university operated MCTYI; and

10 items in decentralized college/university operated MCTYI.

Of the suggested changes, placement was suggested at the level of the:

1. Campus for 46 times for centralized community junior colleges;

51 times for decentralized community junior colleges;

66 times for centralized college/university operated MCTYI; and

11 times for decentralized college/university operated MCTYI.

2. District - 9 times for centralized community junior colleges;

7 times for decentralized community junior colleges;

3 times for centralized college/university operated MCTYI; and

2 times for decentralized college/university operated MCTYI.

3. Shared for 11 times for centralized community junior colleges;

11 times for decentralized community junior colleges;

13 times for centralized college/university operated MCTYI; and

0 times for decentralized college/university operated MCTYI.

The reader is reminded that the number of institutions vary from one type to another. The number of suggestions for change may not be compared on an absolute number basis. This limitation is somewhat dulled in that a comparison was made on the basis of the number of items; yet, the effect of differing group sizes among the types of MCTYI cannot be discounted.

Statistical Treatment of the Placement of Authority and Responsibility in MCTYI

This section is concerned with the statistical treatment of the data generated by the study. The purpose of the statistics is to determine if there is any statistically significant difference between the four identified types of MCTYI. For this purpose, the simple statistic of Chi Square was chosen.

As a statistic, Chi Square is a widely understood treatment and deserves no lengthly explanation. The concept is essentially one of comparing certain characteristics of distributions to determine if there is likelihood that the compared distributions are found in a common

universe. The likelihood may be predicted in terms of a percentage or probability. For this study, the decision to accept a probability of ninety-five per cent was defined as significant. Thus, if the value of Chi Square is ninety-five per cent or greater, the distributions being compared will be considered as coming from a common universe and, therefore, alike. Any Chi Square value of less than ninety-five per cent will identify a statistically significant difference between the distributions being compared.

It will be remembered that twelve questions have been posed regarding statistically significant differences in the placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one items common to the four types of MCTYI studied. Four of the twelve questions compared current practices; four compared suggested changes; and four compared suggested changes to current practices regarding the placement of management authority and responsibility.

Limitations on the application of Chi Square to suggested changes in the placement of management authority and responsibility were found. Examination of Tables 8 through 11 revealed that by comparison to Tables 4 through 7, few suggestions were made. The total number of suggestions was fairly high, but on an item by item comparison, there were not many. It was suggested then that intrinsically, the suggested changes were not statistically

treatable. Further, as Guilford points out, "There are lower limits to utilizable frequencies, beyond which even Yates's correction is inadequate."[1]

For these two reasons, namely the intrinsic suspicion of the low number of suggested changes in relation to current practices and a direct warning from a recognized source on statistical technique, the decision was made not to apply Chi Square analysis to the questions relating to suggested changes. This decision eliminated eight of the twelve questions to be asked of the data. The questions are presented in summarized form on page thirty-one. Note that of the twelve questions that were to be asked, only four or the twelve questions do not involve the placement of suggested changes in management authority and responsibility.

Due to the dearth of research in the locus of authority and responsibility in MCTYI it was neither predictable nor anticipated that so comparatively few responses to suggested changes would be reported. On the contrary, it had been presumed that the on-site chief administrators of a MCTYI would take the opportunity to suggest changes in the locus of authority and responsibility much more extensively than was reported.

Even though the frequencies by items of suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility

---

[1]Guilford, Fundamental Statistics, p. 238.

were too small to compare statistically, the gross number indicates a trend. This trend was invariably toward more functions being placed at the campus level than toward any other level of placement. This trend would predict an increase in campus autonomy if the suggested changes were carried out.

The remaining data regarding the current placement of management authority and responsibility have been treated by computer using an accepted Chi Square program called "ChiChi". This Chi Square program is part of the computer programs of Veldman stored in the computer made available for use by students at the University of Southern Mississippi.

The data to which the Veldman, Chi Square computer program has been applied are found in Tables 4 through 7. The results of the Chi Square analysis are reported in Table 12; Chi Square values determined in comparisons of the placement of current authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items in MCTYI. The values reported in Table 12 are the probabilities generated by computer; these values may be interpreted as percentages.

If the value is at least ninety-five per cent, one may conclude that there is the probability that ninety-five times out of 100, if one makes a comparison of the specific data in question, a similar or lesser difference in that data will be found. One may be no less than ninety-five

TABLE 12

CHI SQUARE VALUES DETERMINED IN COMPARISONS OF THE PLACEMENT OF CURRENT AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR FACULTY-OF SELECTED ITEMS IN MCTYI

Function	Centralized vs. Decentralized Community Junior Colleges	Centralized vs. Decentralized College/ University Operated	Decentralized Community Junior Colleges vs. College/University Operated	Centralized Community Junior Colleges vs. College/University Operated
1 Certified personnel selection and assignment	9%	54%	20%	31%
2 Classified personnel selection and assignment	8	60	20	14
3 Curriculum planning and development	10	18	00	3
4 Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation	7	1	56	5
5 Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation	2	20	66	76
6 Course content and organization	97*	6	5	00
7 Library book processing	57	70	52	30
8 Admissions and Records	57	60	3	1
9 Food services	26	15	69	2
10 Facility Planning and Utilization research	23	37	57	32
11 Instructional improvement research	27	28	33	61
12 Educational planning research	24	28	6	92
13 Accreditation activities	00	34	2	62
14 Community services	51	59	19	31
15 Publicity	15	50	52	00
16 Administrative data processing	29	24	9	20
17 Purchasing	98*	25	1	3
18 Accounting	55	12	00	6
19 Budget development	18	95*	90	18
20 Budget administration	37	7	5	73
21 Maintenance, buildings, and grounds	62	35	54	9

*No significant difference at 95% or higher level.

per cent sure that the two distributions have come from a common universe or population.

The first column of Table 12 answers the question: In a community junior operated MCTYI, is there in the authority and responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the institutions that have described themselves as having the characteristics decentralization and those that have described themselves as having the characteristics of centralization? All twenty-one items have been compared.

From the first column of Table 12, it may be seen that only item 6 and 17 have a Chi Square value of ninety-five per cent or more. Based on this analysis, there was no difference between these two types of MCTYI for item 6, course content and organization, and item 17, purchasing. The remaining items have a Chi Square value less than ninety-five per cent and the two types of institutions being compared may be said to have unlike placement of authority and responsibility for these items.

Column two of Table 12 answers the question: In a college/university operated MCTYI, is there in the authority and responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the institutions that have described themselves as having the characteristics of decentralization and those that have described themselves as having the characteristics of centralization? All twenty-one items have been compared.

Column two of Table 12 shows that item 19 has a Chi Square value of ninety-five per cent or more. It may be said that for item 19, budget development, there was no difference in the placement of authority and responsibility for the two institutions being compared. The remaining twenty items have a Chi Square value of less than ninety-five per cent and were, therefore, judged to be unlike in terms of the placement of authority and responsibility.

Table 12, column three, answers the question: In a MCTYI that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of decentralization, is there in the authority and the responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the college/university operated and the community junior college operated institution? Again, all twenty-one items have been compared.

Column three, Table 12, has no Chi Square value of ninety-five per cent or more. The judgment may be made then that in terms of the placement of authority and responsibility, these two types of institutions were unlike.

Column four of Table 12 provides the answer to the question: In a MCTYI that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of centralization, is there in the authority and the

responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the college/university operated and community junior college operated institution? All twenty-one items have been compared.

Collumn four of Table 12 has no Chi Square values of ninety-five per cent or more. The judgment may be made then that in terms of the placement of authority and responsibility, these two types of institutions were unlike.

Summary

In Chapter III biographical and institutional data received from 154 MCTYI were presented. Chapter III also contained statements regarding the current placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items or functions thought to be common to almost all MCTYI and suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility for the twenty-one items. Included also was a Chi Square analysis of each of the twenty-one items comparing the current placement of authority and responsibility *viz*:

1. Centralized versus decentralized community junior college operated MCTYI;
2. Centralized versus decentralized college/university operated MCTYI;
3. Decentralized community junior college versus college/university operated MCTYI; and
4. Centralized community junior college versus college/university operated MCTYI.

The 154 MCTYI responding to the study were classified into four primary categories representing types of MCTYI. There were found to be thirty-four centralized and sixty-one decentralized community junior college operated MCTYI, and forty centralized and nineteen decentralized college/university operated MCTYI.

Chapter III was to have included additional Chi Square comparisons involving the suggested changes for the twenty-one items. The number of suggested changes reported by each of the four types of MCTYI were so few that Chi Square analysis was not recommended. The absence of sufficient data caused eight of the original twelve questions to be eliminated. A trend toward the authority and responsibility for more functions being placed at the campus level was indicated by the gross data.

In summary, the findings of the four questions relating to current placement of management authority and responsibility were as follows:

1. Centralized versus decentralized community junior college operated MCTYI were substantially unlike in the current placement of authority and responsibility for the twenty-one items under study. Only the current placement of authority and responsibility for items six and eighteen were considered to be the same. For these two MCTYI item six, course content and organization, was the authority and responsibility of the campus in a

majority of the institutions; item 17, purchasing, was the authority and responsibility of the district in a majority of the institutions.

2. Centralized versus decentralized college/university operated MCTYI were substantially unlike in the placement of authority and responsibility for all but one of the functions. The placement of authority and responsibility for item 19, budget development, was found to be at the shared level in most of the institutions.

3. Decentralized community junior college versus college/university operated MCTYI were unlike in the current placement of authority and responsibility. There was no area of authority and responsibility that was placed at the same level of administration when judged by Chi Square at the five per cent level of significance.

4. Centralized community junior college versus college/university operated MCTYI were judged to be unlike in the current placement of authority and responsibility at the five per cent level of significance. The level of placement for all twenty-one items was different for these two types of MCTYI.

A recapitulation of the current placement of management authority and responsibility is found on pages forty-nine and fifty, while a similar recapitulation of suggestions for change in the placement of management authority and responsibility is found on pages fifty-seven

and fifty-eight. These recapitulations augment the statistical findings.

In the ensuing and final chapter, the purposes and findings of the study are summarized. Conclusions are drawn and recommendations for further study are made.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The development of multi-campus two-year institutions represents a contemporary effort to solve the problems of population impact, economic necessity, and social necessity. As a relatively new type of educational structure, and one where there appears to be a high level of interest, it was surprising to find so few studies documenting or otherwise describing the MCTYI.

The general absence of information in the field of MCTYI provided much of the incentive for this study. Specifically, this study was designed to determine the current placement of management authority and responsibility as well as to gather suggested changes in the placement of management authority and responsibility for all identifiable MCTYI.

While the principal objective of the study was to review selected aspects of centralization versus autonomy of MCTYI, there was also felt the need to describe the campus chief executive as well as the institution. Included, then, as part of this study was limited biographical and institutional data to give the reader a sense of perspective.

Having reviewed literature in the area of MCTYI, it was determined that community junior college MCTYI, the MCTYI branches of colleges and universities, and state systems of MCTYI had been the subject of few studies. In short, there existed a large gap in information regarding all types of MCTYI. This gap embraced administration and control of MCTYI, as well as other areas not included in this study.

It was determined from the A.A.J.C. publication, 1971 Junior College Directory, that there were 235 campuses belonging to sixty institutions. These sixty institutions were located in twenty-six states. This study attempted a census. About seventy-five per cent of the census population participated in the study.

To determine the extent of campus autonomy, a questionnaire which listed twenty-one selected items or functions thought to be common to all MCTYI was used. The questionnaire used was a modification of the questionnaire originally designed by Dr. John S. Hansen for use in the Kintzer, Jensen, and Hansen study. Each MCTYI listed in the 1971 Junior College Directory was asked to indicate the current placement as well as suggested changes in the placement of management authority and responsibility for these twenty-one items.

Four types of institutions were identified, based on the criteria of how the campus viewed the central or

district office, and whether the campus was part of a community junior college or part of a college/university operated system. State operated MCTYI were grouped with MCTYI of colleges and universities. The four types of MCTYI were identified as:

1. Centralized community junior college operated;
2. Decentralized community junior college operated;
3. Centralized college/university operated; and
4. Decentralized college/university operated.

This study proposed questions to be asked for the purpose of determining if there actually was any difference between the four different types of institutions in terms of management authority and responsibility. These questions in summary form were:

Is there any difference in decentralized MCTYI between--

1. current practices of community junior college and college/university operated MCTYI;
2. suggested changes of community junior college and college/university operated MCTYI;
3. current practices and suggested changes of college/universiety operated MCTYI;
4. current practices and suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

Is there any difference in centralized MCTYI between--

5. current practices of community junior and college/university operated MCTYI;

6. suggested changes of community junior college and college/university operated MCTYI;

7. current practices and suggested changes of college/university operated MCTYI;

8. current practices and suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

Is there any difference between centralized and decentralized--

9. current practices of college/university operated MCTYI;

10. suggested changes of college/university operated MCTYI;

11. current practices of community junior college operated MCTYI;

12. suggested changes of community junior college operated MCTYI?

This study involved the asking of these twelve questions for each of the twenty-one items. There were 252 comparisons and Chi Square applications to consider. Significant difference was defined as having a Chi Square value of less than ninety-five per cent probability.

Presented also in the study is a summarization of selected biographical and institutional data for each of the four types of institutions. No other treatment was given to the biographical/institutional data and these data were not incorporated in any way in the Chi Square analysis of the twenty-one items. The information was made available so that the reader could conjecture about any relationships that might have been of interest to him.

Conclusions

Limited biographical and institutional data were gathered. These data were summarized for each of the four types of institutions. The sole intent of these data was to provide the reader with some basis for making value judgments about the balance of the data found in the study. In one sense, the biographical/institutional data lent validity and reliability to the general nature of the study as a whole.

One may conclude from these data that each of the four types of institutions studied are basically alike in terms of institutional characteristics. One may also conclude that the chief campus executives studied are basically alike on the basis of the biographical data presented. It is recognized, of course, that nuances were present in this data.

The limited number of suggested changes in the placement of authority and responsibility precluded answering eight of the twelve questions. Of the eight questions affected, each contained a comparison of suggested changes and were voided because the number of suggested changes were too small to be treated by Chi Square. One may conclude that while there are institutions that do suggest change in the placement of management authority and responsibility, there is general satisfaction with the current placement of authority and responsibility.

If changes do take place in the placement of authority and responsibility in accord with the changes suggested by campus chief executives, more of the twenty-one functions will be placed at the campus level. There were more suggestions to place authority and responsibility at the campus level than were made to place authority and responsibility at the district or shared level, as reported in Tables 8 through 11.

The four questions that remain to be answered and the conclusions of those questions are as follow:

1. In a community junior college operated MCTYI, is there in the authority and responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the institutions that have described themselves as having the characteristics of decentralization and those that have described themselves as having the characteristics of centralization?

One may conclude, based on the Chi Square values given in Table 12, page sixty-two, that except for the placement of authority and responsibility for item 6, course content and organization, and item 17, purchasing, these two types of institutions are unlike in the placement of authority and responsibility for the remainder of the twenty-one items. The placement of authority and responsibility for item 6 and item 17 is alike for centralized and decentralized community junior college operated MCTYI.

2. In a college or university operated MCTYI, is there in the authority and responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the institutions that have described themselves as having the characteristics of decentralization and those that have described themselves as having the characteristics of centralization?

One may conclude, based on the Chi Square values given in Table 12, page sixty-two, that except for the placement of authority and responsibility for item 19, budget development, these two types of institutions are unlike in the placement of authority and responsibility for the remainder of the twenty-one items. The placement of authority and responsibility for budget development is alike for these two institutions.

3. In a MCTYI that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of decentralization, is there in the authority and responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the college or university operated institution and the community junior college operated institution?

One may conclude, based on the Chi Square values given in Table 12, page sixty-two, that these two types of institutions are unlike in the placement of authority and responsibility. There are no areas where the placement of authority and responsibility are alike.

4. In a MCTYI that has been described by the chief campus administrator as having the characteristics of centralization, is there in the authority and responsibility currently being practiced, any difference between the college or university operated institution and the community junior college operated institution?

One may conclude, based on Table 12, page sixty-two, that these two types of institutions are unlike in the placement of authority and responsibility. There are no areas where the placement of authority and responsibility are alike.

Based on the responses to these four questions, one may conclude that there are four distinct types of MCTYI. There were eighty-four Chi Square comparisons made, twenty-one for each of the four questions answered above. Of the eighty-four Chi Square comparisons, only 3/84 identified placements of authority and responsibility that were alike; therefore, there are four distinct types of MCTYI.

These MCTYI types are:

1. centralized community junior college;
2. decentralized community junior college;
3. centralized college/university operated; and
4. decentralized college/university operated, MCTYI.

One may conclude that the four types of MCTYI operate differently in terms of the overall placement of

authority and responsibility. Therefore, it is apparent that while all of the MCTYI serve as an educational resource to a community, the management philosophy--as expressed through the placement of authority and responsibility for twenty-one selected items--is different.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. More attention be given to studying MCTYI.
2. The educational philosophies of MCTYI be reviewed to determine if there are differences.
3. This study be replicated to determine if changes in the placement of authority and responsibility have taken place.
4. A study similar in nature and design be made of the district chief executive's perception of the placement of authority and responsibility.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

(Questionnaire)

MULTI-CAMPUS AUTHORITY/ RESPONSIBILITY SURVEY ©

Your time is valuable. Your contribution and information are valuable. This survey is designed to take about 10-15 minutes to complete. The design of the study dictates that the study be completed only by the on-campus chief executive.

The purpose of the survey is to determine the relationship of the on-site multi-campus chief executive to the district/central office.

Anonymity is guaranteed through data pooling. Neither the institution nor the individual will be identifiable.

***

PART II--AUTHORITY/RESPONSIBILITY DATA

This last section is designed to determine the placement of authority and responsibility characteristic of your system, and to determine if any change in this placement is suggested.

Areas of general authority/responsibility are listed. A "CURRENT" and a "SUGGESTED" column are given. Using the symbols, please circle who is primarily performing the function. If the function is principally shared, where both the campus and the district/central office participate in a decision, circle both symbols. In those areas where a change is suggested, circle as appropriate in the "Suggested"column. Otherwise leave blank.

D/d represents the DISTRICT or central office

C/c represents the CAMPUS or your responsibility

	CURRENT		SUGGESTED		FUNCTION
1	D	C	d	c	Certified personnel selection and assignment
2	D	C	d	c	Classified personnel selection and assignment
3	D	C	d	c	Curriculum planning and development
4	D	C	d	c	Transfer curriculum approval prior to board presentation
5	D	C	d	c	Terminal or occupational curriculum approval prior to board presentation
6	D	C	d	c	Course content and organization
7	D	C	d	c	Library book processing
8	D	C	d	c	Admissions and Records
9	D	C	d	c	Food services
10	D	C	d	c	Facility planning and utilization research
11	D	C	d	c	Instructional improvement research
12	D	C	d	c	Educational planning research
13	D	C	d	c	Accreditation activities
14	D	C	d	c	Community services
15	D	C	d	c	Publicity
16	D	C	d	c	Administrative data processing
17	D	C	d	c	Purchasing
18	D	C	d	c	Accounting
19	D	C	d	c	Budget development
20	D	C	d	c	Budget administration
21	D	C	d	c	Maintenance, buildings, and grounds

APPENDIX B

(Questionnaire Release)

615 City Park Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70119
April 3, 1972

Dr. John S. Hansen
Assistant Superintendent, Education
State Center Community College District
924 N. Van Ness Avenue
Fresno, California 93728

Dear Dr. Hansen:

Thank you very kindly for the verbal approval to modify and adapt the questionnaire developed by you in Chapter 4, The Multi-Institution Junior College District.

As I explained by telephone, it is my intention to review selected aspects of the organization and administration of multi-campus junior colleges. This, of course, represents my dissertation area. I anticipate that I will update much of the information collected by you, Dr. Kintzer and Dr. Jensen. I shall make certain that you receive a copy when it is finally completed and approved.

Cordially,

John T. Wynn

State Center Community College District

924 N. VAN NESS AVENUE • FRESNO, CALIFORNIA 93728 • TELEPHONE (209) 233-8475

STUART M. WHITE
SUPERINTENDENT

JOHN S. HANSEN
ASST. SUPERINTENDENT
EDUCATION

GARLAND P. REED
ASST. SUPERINTENDENT
BUSINESS

TRUSTEES

RUDY S. JOHNSON, PRESIDENT
LYNN B. FORD, VICE PRESIDENT
BAXTER K. RICHARDSON, SECRETARY
DAVID L. CREIGHTON
HARRY E. PIRAOKA
RAY M. MILES, D.D.S.
EDWARD R. MOSLEY, M.D.

March 28, 1972

Mr. John Wynn
615 City Park Avenue
New Orleans, Louisana 70119

Dear Mr. Wynn:

The purpose of this communication is to verify the oral assurance I provided you in our phone conversation yesterday that it is with my unreserved approval that you utilize in your dissertation project the instrument which I devised to obtain information for Chapter 4, The Multi-Institution Junior College District. Please feel free to adapt it to suit your purposes.

Best of luck with your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Jack

John S. Hansen
Assistant Superintendent, Education

JSH:hjs

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

American Association of Junior Colleges. 1971 Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C.:1971.

Ayers, Archie R. and Russel, John H. Internal Structure: Organization and Administration of Institutions of Higher Education. Washinton, D.C.:U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin No. 9 (OE-53012), 1962.

Berdahl, Robert O. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.:American Council on Education, 1971.

Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York:McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Croxton, Frederick E., and Cowden, Dudley J. Applied General Statistics. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., (Ed.) American Junior Colleges. 7th ed. Washington, D.C.:American Council on Education, 1967.

Glenny, Lyman A. Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination. New York:McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology. New York:McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Kintzer, Frederick C., Jensen, Arthur M., and Hansen, John S. The Multi-Institution Junior College District. Washington:American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

New Directions in Statewide Higher Education Planning and Coordination. Southern Regional Education Board, September, 1970.

Veldman, Donald J. Fortran for the Behavioral Sciences. New York:Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Periodicals

Alt, Weston M. "Aspects of the Junior College." Research in Education, February, 1969.

Doi, James I. "Administrative Concerns." The Journal of Higher Education, October, 1967.

Erickson, Clifford G. "Multi-Campus Operation in the Big City." The Junior College Journal, October, 1964.

Hickman, Marmette, and Lieske, Gustave R. "The Current Status of Community College Organization, Control, and Support." Research in Education, March, 1969.

Holderman, Kenneth R. "The Case for University Branch Campuses." The Junior College Journal, March, 1964.

Jensen, Arthur M. "Urban Community Colleges Go Multi-Campus." The Junior College Journal, November, 1965.

Jones, Richard L. "An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Jordan and Lakewood Extension Campus Programs of Long Beach City College." Research in Education, June, 1968.

Lahti, Robert E. "Commission Commitments." The Junior College Journal, December, 1966.

Marsee, Stuart E. "When is Large Too Big?" The Junior College Journal, December, 1966.

Masiko, Peter, Jr. "Going Multi-Campus." The Junior College Journal, October, 1966.

Morrissey, Kermit C. "Creative Leadership of Multi-Unit Colleges." The Junior College Journal, September, 1967.

Roueche, John E. "The Junior College President." Junior College Research Review, June, 1968.

Wattenbarger, James L. "Changing Patterns of Control: Local or State." The Junior College Journal, May, 1968.

Wynn, John T. "Administering Multicampus Junior Colleges." College and University Business, September, 1972.

Unpublished Materials

Jensen, Arthur M. "An Investigation of the Administration of Junior College Districts with Multi-Campuses." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Los Angeles: University of California, 1965.

Jones, Milton O. "The Development of Multi-Unit Junior Colleges." Unpublished study, Los Angeles:University of California, 1968.

LaVire, Willis A. "The Critical Tasks for Public Junior College Administrators." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Florida, 1961.

VITA

VITA

John Thomas Wynn, middle son of Sam and Marjorie Wynn of Dallas, Texas, was born in Corsicana, Texas, in 1938. He married Sally Adams of Dallas, Texas in 1958, and is the father of Martha, Catherine, and Lorraine.

After graduating from Highland Park High School in Dallas, he earned an A.S. from Wharton County Junior College in 1960, a B.B.A. from The Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas in 1962, a M.B.A. from Texas A&M University in 1965, and a Ph.D. from the University of Southern Mississippi in 1973.

He has served on the faculty of Texas A&M, School of Business; as Assistant Registrar, Texas A&M. He has served as an international consultant with the Agency for International Development as well as for other research agencies. He is presently Dean of the Campus-West Bank, and Dean, Division of Business Studies for Delgado Junior College, New Orleans, Louisiana.

He received an honorable discharge in 1962 after serving in the army seven years.

Professional organizations of which he is a member include Phi Delta Kappa, Kappa Delta Pi, and Sigma Beta Pi.

His publications include: "Economic Effects of the Highway Beautification Program," 1966, by Wynn and others; "Marketing Survey Mission Report," Dominican Republic,

1966, by Wynn and others; "Shall Students be Given a Greater Voice in School Administration?" Mississippi Researcher 1971; and "Administering Multicampus Junior Colleges," College and University Business, 1972.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 21 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION